

AC901

#35

Kemalist Pretensions—Conditions in the Near East

Speech of
Hon. William H. King
of Utah

in the

Senate of the United States

January 26, 1923



Washington
Government Printing Office
1923

47747—23718

Jurius F. Wells

526



Kemalist Pretensions—Conditions in the Near East.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. KING,
OF UTAH,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Friday, January 26 (legislative day of January 23), 1923,
On the appeal of Mustapha Kemal to the American people and conditions
in the Near East.

CONDITIONS IN THE NEAR EAST.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] has offered for the RECORD what he denominates a remarkable address issued by Mustapha Kemal to the American people. The Senator refers to this revolutionary Turkish leader as a man of education and one who is advised concerning the "history of nations."

And, with a fine sense of justice, the able Senator declares that the Ottoman Turks are entitled to a hearing before the bar of public opinion and are also entitled to liberty and to the enjoyment of political rights. I will not disagree with the distinguished Senator in these views, but in determining what attitude should be taken toward the Turks and what restrictions, if any, should be imposed upon them by the allied and associated powers, many facts and circumstances must be taken into consideration. Of course, speaking academically, the Ottoman Turks have the right to freedom and independence and to establish a form of government which to them seems best, but that is not the paramount question at issue now between the Turks and the allied nations and the United States.

The appeal by Kemal Pasha, to which the Senator refers, is a most adroit and intriguing document. One would suppose that it emanated from a man who had been schooled in democracy and who was guided by the spirit of a Hampden or a Chatham or a Patrick Henry and was seeking to extend the principles of liberty throughout the world. It is a subtle appeal, which undoubtedly, it is hoped, will temper the sharp edge of world-wide criticism because of the barbarities perpetrated by the Kemalists and the Turks upon Christian minorities within what have been and doubtless will be the boundaries of the Turkish Empire. It is likewise an appeal to justify the refusal of the Turks to abide by the treaty of Sevres or to enter into a fair and just treaty with the allied representatives during the protracted negotiations at Lausanne.

Mr. President, the publicity given to this statement by Mustapha Kemal calls for some reply and justifies a discussion, within proper limits, of what is known as "the Turkish ques-

tion," which comprises the issues presented in the Near East. I read in this morning's paper the statement the Senator from Oklahoma has just placed before us and am somewhat surprised that it so soon finds its way into the RECORD. In order that we may have a better understanding of the situation and be better prepared to determine just what the rights of the Ottoman Turks are, it is proper that a hasty though obviously an imperfect review of certain historical facts should be made, and in so doing I want to present the cause of the Armenians and show what they have suffered at the hands of the Turks, including this same Mustapha Kemal.

Kemal Pasha assumes that the Turks rightfully occupy the territory which constituted the kingdom of Armenia and all of Asia Minor and are entitled to the possession and control of Thrace and perhaps other territory in Europe; and he assumes the competency of the Turks to govern and to extend freedom and justice to all races and creeds within the boundaries of Turkish authority. Perhaps title to land, if not to peoples, may be acquired by prescription initiated by force and violence and maintained by cruelty and bloodshed. But one can be forgiven for questioning the validity of such title and requiring that other muniments of title be submitted in the court of public opinion and before the bar of international justice. A discussion of the Turkish question compels an examination of conditions in western Asia and in what we call the Balkan territory, anterior to the appearance of the oriental hordes which swept down from central Asia in more recent times.

We have heard much of the Armenians and have for many years protested against the cruel policies executed by the Turks, which had for their object the extermination of this splendid race. But there are many who do not know the history of this brave people, and there are some who are inclined to think that they have sought to intrude themselves into Turkish territory and usurp the authority exercised by the Turkish Government. The fact is that the Armenians migrated to Asia Minor from southeastern Europe more than 2,500 years ago. They belong to the Aryan race and find their roots in the same soil from which sprang European peoples. Philologists declare their language to be Indo-European and their literature gives support to that view.

The historian Strabo declares that they migrated from Thessaly and established themselves in the country which for centuries has been called Armenia. Professor Ripley, in his valuable work *The Races of Europe*, states that:

The second racial type in this borderland (Armenia) between Europe and Asia we may safely follow Chantre in calling Armenoid, because the Armenians most clearly represent it to-day. * * * The similarity of this to our Alpine races of western Europe has been especially emphasized by the most competent authority, Von Luschan. * * * Were it not for the potent selective influence of religion (Christianity and Mohammedanism) complete rupture by the invading Tartar-Turks might conceivably have taken place. As it is, the continuity of the Alpine races across Asia Minor can not be doubted.

I mentioned the historian Strabo. He refers to the origin of the Armenian people and speaks of Jason and his expedition into Armenia, and states that from "Armeus the country had its name."

Some historians of note claim that the progenitors of the Armenians migrated from Thrace about 1,400 years B. C., and after crossing into Asia they passed through Bythnia and entered Cappadocia and Cilicia, from which countries, some time in the seventh or eighth century, B. C., they reached the broad plateau upon which is Mount Ararat. In this region they remained and extended their occupation until they brought within their authority that vast region which was known as the kingdom of Armenia, and with the boundaries of which, generally speaking, we are familiar.

I think it is now accepted by historians and philologists that the Illyrians, whom we now know as the Albanians, the Phrygians, the Greeks, and the Armenians all belong to the same branch of the Aryan family. At one time it was believed by some writers that the Armenian language was a branch of the Persian, but that view is discredited and is no longer accepted by authorities who have written upon the origin of races and the development of languages. The earlier boundaries of Armenia may not perhaps be definitely determined, but it is generally agreed by historians that Armenia at one time embraced that vast domain extending from the Black and Caspian Seas southwesterly to the Mediterranean Sea, comprising an area of approximately 150,000 square miles. Cilicia, or, as it is sometimes called, Lesser Armenia, which borders upon the extreme northeastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea, constituted its southwesterly extremity.

To the west of Armenia is Anatolia, which we commonly call Asia Minor. The greater part of Armenia is a vast plateau from which rise mountains and within which are found valleys and deserts. It possesses varied resources and contains extensive and valuable agricultural lands and rich mineral deposits. The Armenians were in contact with the Pontian Greeks, who occupied a portion of Asia Minor to the west of Armenia and along the southern littoral of the Black Sea, as well as with the Hellenic peoples of the Mediterranean and Aegean Seas. To the south and east were the Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes, and Persians, and the various races and peoples who inhabited the successive kingdoms that rose and fell in Persia and Mesopotamia.

The Armenians were known to be a strong, vigorous, intellectual, and progressive people. Long prior to the days of Cæsar and the dawn of the Christian era their fame had spread throughout the civilized world. During the ministry of St. Paul they were visited by the Apostles Thaddeus and Bartholomew, who introduced Christianity among them. The new faith spread throughout the land, and about the year 300 A. D. it was accepted by the King of Armenia, who established it as the State religion. From that time until the present, the Armenian race have persevered in their adherence to the Christian faith.

Some historians state that the inhabitants of what is called Armenia are first mentioned in the annals of the Assyrians many hundred years before Christ. The Assyrian armies made war upon them, but in the ninth century before Christ the Armenians united and formed what was called the Kingdom of

Urartu. These same historians contend that the powerful Kingdom of the Medes made war upon the Kingdom of Urartu and brought its inhabitants under rule of that powerful nation. It is further shown by these historians that later King Darius of Persia asserted dominion over the great plateau north of Mesopotamia and south of the Caucasus Mountains, and which was inhabited by the Armenian race.

During the period of Persian domination Armenia was divided into two satrapies for administrative purposes. But these political subdivisions were practically independent, the people paying but a small tribute to the Persian Government. In the second century before Christ the Armenians revolted from the authority of the Seleucid King of western Asia. A few centuries later Tigranes the Great became King over Armenia. He possessed great executive and administrative ability and brought honor and fame to his country. He was related to Mithradites, the famous Pontic King, who sought to build an empire uniting the Hellenic and Iranian peoples. The Roman power, however, shattered his dream and also constituted an impediment to the growth and development of the Armenian Kingdom, which now became a buffer State between Rome on the west and the Parthian rulers of Iran.

Tigranes developed the spirit of Armenian nationality and linked the Armenian people to the West, removing from them any veneer of Persian Zoroasterianism.

For several centuries Armenia was in the eddy of the great contending forces of the East and the West. It was besieged and assailed by the Parthian armies, and upon the death of King Tiridates, who had accepted Christianity and established it as the State religion, his kingdom fell, a portion of the people coming under Persian rule and the residue acknowledging Roman authority.

But the Armenians remained devoted to the new faith which they had espoused, and no persecution was sufficient to alienate them from that faith. For several centuries the conflicting tides of the East and the West rolled over them, but they clung to their national church and to their political ideals, whether their rulers were Persians or Romans.

In the seventh century the control of western Asia passed to the Arabs, and in the eighth or ninth century the power of the caliphate declined and the Armenians established a Christian principality which survived for several centuries. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries nomadic Turkish tribes marched from Asia and fell upon Persia and Armenia and countries which had been controlled for several centuries by the Arabs. The Armenian rulers sought protection from the Roman Empire of the East, but its lethargy and inherent weakness afforded but slight protection against the savage assaults of the barbarous Asiatic Turks in their western movements.

Near the end of the thirteenth century the Karluks and other wild Asiatic hordes invaded western Asia and the barbarous Mongols, who destroyed civilization wherever they found it, swept through Persia and over the Armenian plateau during the same century. For several centuries anarchy and chaos reigned in western Asia. Then came the Osmanli to power. This was a Turkish clan which attempted to bring under its

authority western Asia and eastern Europe. It expanded across the Dardanelles and extended its authority as far as the gates of Vienna. Armenia was completely overrun as early as 1514, and in the sixteenth century the eastern world from Vienna to Persia was linked under one control. From that time until the present, broadly speaking, Armenia, except the Province of Erivan, which was conquered by the Persians in the seventeenth century and held until 1834, when it was ceded to Russia, and the Province of Kars, which was acquired by Russia in 1878, has been under Turkish rule.

It will thus be perceived that the Armenians for centuries constituted the outer bulwark of western civilization, against which the invasions of Mongols and Turks and Tartars and Saracens and barbaric hordes were directed. They occupied the great highways leading from southeastern Europe to Asia, and along these highways wild Asiatic hordes traveled like successive billows of the sea seeking the conquest of superior races and the acquisition of the lands which were the homes and countries of other races.

The pages of history do not record a more courageous and valorous people than the Armenians. None have exhibited greater fidelity to their religious convictions and to their ideals. Besieged upon every hand, robbed and plundered and butchered by successive invading hordes, they survived; however, millions were killed, and the tragedies and sorrows with which they were visited only strengthened the faith of survivors, increased their tenacity, and nerved them for still greater sorrows and heavier persecutions. The Ottoman Turks, when they inundated their territory, destroyed hundreds of their towns and cities, and slaughtered hundreds of thousands of their people. They conquered Mesopotamia, Armenia, Syria, Palestine, the country we call Asia Minor, and pushed on into western Europe. It was the Armenian people who held back for many years the Tartars and the Turks, and thus enabled the peoples of Europe to prepare themselves for the final contest before the gates of Vienna in 1683. The victorious march of these barbarous hordes was stayed and they were thrown back into the Balkan Peninsula. Greece, Constantinople, Thrace, and the territory which we now know as Bulgaria, Rumania, Serbia, all passed under the crescent of the Turk. The heavy hand of Turkey was laid upon the Armenian people. Wild bands of Kurds and Turks and Tartars settled in their midst, robbed them of their lands, plundered them of their property, and inflicted upon them cruel persecutions. The Turkish Government, controlled often by fiends and monsters, imposed upon them oppressive burdens and enforced cruel and merciless edicts.

Under the rule of their own kings and rulers the Armenians enjoyed a large degree of freedom and reached a high place in the civilization of nations. Their frugality and industry, their love of home and country, their earnest application to the development of their fields, and their industrial life gave them a preeminence among the nations and peoples surrounding them which was not denied by their contemporaries and which historians have affirmed. They built cities and towns, established industries, and developed a large domestic and foreign trade and commerce which added to their wealth and in-

fluence. Upon the shores of three seas they built ships and constructed ports from which rich argosies went and returned to add to their wealth and national prosperity. They developed remarkable ability in business pursuits and enterprises and pioneered the way into other countries for the sale of their products. They brought remote peoples together and nations into contact, through trade and by means of commercial transactions. While possessing a strong nationalistic spirit and a pride in their own land, they were catholic in their views and sought to break down narrow and provincial prejudices and those extreme racial antipathies which have been provocative of so much controversy and, indeed, bloodshed in the past. As I have indicated, for centuries prior to the conquest of their country by the Turks they had been assailed by the wild, barbarous tribes and the nomadic forces from western and central Asia and had sustained losses and been the victims of cruel and rapacious raids and destructive ravages.

The topography of their country, with its lofty mountains and mighty valleys and plains, influenced the character of the people. The historian Buckle, in his monumental work, attempts to establish the thesis that physical surroundings and climatic conditions not only influence but perhaps determine the thoughts, characters, and lives of the people. He attributes the characteristics of the Scotch, as exemplified in such men as John Knox and the Covenanters, to the bleak highlands and the rugged conditions of Scotland. Nature was harsh and stern and relentless as he perceived her manifestations in the cliffs and rocks and sterile lands of Scotland. He found in this remarkable race a reproduction of nature's inflexible form and frowning face.

Be that as it may, the Armenians in many ways reflected their physical surroundings. The noble mountains, reaching into the skies, and the far-reaching plains and the deserts fading into the horizon were ever before them as objects, or subjects, rather, which influenced their lives. They saw in these great works of nature the creative power of an Omnipotent One.

After Christianity had been accepted by them and had become a State religion, they were imbued with the thought that they were the guardians of immortal truth and were to be ambassadors of the risen Lord for the salvation of man. Their literature and art reveal how strongly their lives were influenced by Christianity. Historians refer to the wonderful developments of music and art among the Armenians following the acceptance of the teachings of the Apostles. Mr. Henry F. B. Lynch, in his work upon Armenia, refers to the architectural development among the Armenians and ascribes to them the origin of the gothic style. They erected thousands of churches which exhibited the most beautiful forms of architectural design and testified to the religious devotion and spiritual aspirations of the people.

The Armenians gave attention to education, established schools and seminaries of learning, and applied in their community life those policies and virtues and charities which have demonstrated a high degree of culture among Christian nations. They possessed a respect for the law and established

courts which administered justice among the people. Many of the young men of Armenia attended the great centers of learning in Athens, Rome, and Alexandria, and thousands of them found positions of trust and responsibility in the business activities of other nations as well as in the governments to which they went. They became financiers, generals, statesmen, and teachers in other countries than their own. Some of the greatest military leaders of Russia and other near-by nations were Armenians. In the days of the Byzantine Empire many of its emperors and empresses were Armenians, among them being Maurice, Philip, Leo, Basyl, Alexander, and Constantine. The Armenians have furnished prime ministers for Persia, Egypt, and Hungary, and they have also filled high administrative positions, even under the Turkish Government. Armenia has furnished the world with brilliant poets and musicians and painters, and has taken high rank in all intellectual fields.

When we recall the vicissitudes through which this noble race has passed and the persecutions and woes which have pursued it for centuries, we can only express wonder at the mighty record of achievement and the imperishable legacy which it has left for the enrichment of the world. Our admiration for the Armenians is increased when we remember the awful conditions which have surrounded them, particularly under Turkish rule.

It is not too much to say that if Armenia had not been invaded and the Armenian race had been permitted to pursue its destiny unmolested by the Tartars and Kurds and Turks, and the Asiatic tribes that were ever at their door, they would have developed into a mighty nation with millions of inhabitants who would have challenged the admiration of the world and been a beacon light to the peoples of the Near East and, indeed, to eastern Europe and western Asia.

If the Christian nations of Europe had given help to Armenia in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, there would have been no Turkish question. The Pan-Turanian movement would have been halted at the eastern borders of Armenia. Greece would have become a mighty nation, and history would not have recorded the centuries of bloodshed and oppression to which the Christian peoples of Greece and the Balkan States have been subjected.

As I have indicated earlier in my remarks, there has not been an understanding by Americans or Europeans of the great contributions made by Armenia to the cause of Christian civilization and to the progress and enlightenment of the world. Many have forgotten, if they ever knew, that Armenia was a well-organized nation administering justice and developing a fine culture at least 1,000 years before any other nation in Europe except Greece and Rome, and that her origin dates back to an earlier period than that of the Roman Empire.

Under the inspiration of the Christian religion the progress of Armenia was phenomenal. During the first two centuries of the Christian era an Armenian alphabet was developed, the Bible was translated into the vernacular of the people, the foreign trade and commerce of the country was increased, and great progress was made in education and culture.

Armenia has given more martyrs to the world in proportion to population than any other land. For centuries her valleys and plains have been incarnadined with the blood of her martyrs.

Under Turkish rule their property has been confiscated, their cities and towns have been burned, hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children have been deported to die of starvation in the mountain fastnesses and in the deserts or to be murdered by the wild and savage bands of Kurds that surrounded them. Their children have been butchered, their daughters and wives have been seized and taken to Turkish harems, and constant efforts have been made to bring about the complete extermination of the race.

Mr. President, at this point, without reading, I desire to place in the RECORD a few statements made by distinguished writers and statesmen who testify to the fine character and noble qualities of the Armenian people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

Mr. KING. Dr. Cyrus Hamlin states that—

The Armenians are a noble race.

Prof. Karl Roth declares that—

The importance of the Armenian people is often ignored. The Armenians have played in antiquity, and more especially in the Middle Ages, an important rôle. As a factor of civilization in the Orient the Armenian is more important than is generally realized. The Armenians are without doubt intellectually the most awake among all the peoples that inhabit the Ottoman Empire. They are superior to Turks and Kurds.

Dr. E. J. Dillon makes the statement that—

The Armenians constitute the sole civilizing, the sole humanizing element in Anatolia; peaceful to the degree of self-sacrifice, law-abiding to their own undoing, and industrious and hopeful under conditions which would appall the majority of mankind. At their best they are the stuff of which heroes and martyrs are molded.

The late Andrew D. White, former United States ambassador to Germany, in his autobiography states that—

The Armenians are a good people, of large and noble capacities. For ages they have maintained their civilization under oppression that would have crushed almost any other people. The Armenian is one of the finest races in the world. If I were asked to name the most desirable races to be added by immigration to the American population I would name among the very first the Armenian.

Lord Bryce, ex-ambassador of Great Britain to the United States, in speaking of the Armenians, declares:

Among all those who dwell in western Asia they stand first, with a capacity for intellectual and moral progress, as well as with a natural tenacity of will and purpose beyond that of all their neighbors—not merely of Turks, Tartars, Kurds, and Persians, but also of Russians. They are a strong race, not only with vigorous nerves and sinews, physically active and energetic, but also of conspicuous brain power.

Henry Morgenthau, ex-United States ambassador to Turkey, in his "Ambassador Morgenthau's Story," pages 287 to 289, states:

The Armenians of the present day are the direct descendants of the people who inhabited the country 3,000 years ago. Their origin is so ancient that it is lost in fable and mystery. There are still undeciphered cuneiform inscriptions on the rocky hills of Van, the largest Armenian city, that have led certain scholars—though not many, I must admit—to identify the Armenian race with the Hittites of the Bible. What is definitely known about the Armenians, however, is that

for ages they have constituted the most civilized and most industrious race in the eastern section of the Ottoman Empire. From their mountains they have spread over the Sultan's dominions, and form a considerable element in the population of all the large cities. Everywhere they are known for their industry, their intelligence, and their decent and orderly lives. They are so superior to the Turks intellectually and morally that much of the business and industry has passed into their hands. With the Greeks the Armenians constitute the economic strength of the empire. These people became Christians in the fourth century, and established the Armenian Church as their State religion. This is said to be the oldest Christian church in existence.

In face of persecutions which have had no parallel elsewhere these people have clung to their early Christian faith with the utmost tenacity. For fifteen hundred years they have lived there in Armenia, a little island of Christians surrounded by backward peoples of hostile religion and hostile race. Their long existence has been one unending martyrdom. The territory which they inhabit forms the connecting link between Europe and Asia, and all the Asiatic invasions—Saracens, Tartars, Mongols, Kurds, and Turks—have passed over their peaceful country. For centuries they thus been the Belgium of the east. Through all this period the Armenians have regarded themselves not as Asiatic but as Europeans. They speak an Indo-European language, their racial origin is believed by scholars to be Aryan, and the fact that their religion is the religion of Europe has always made them turn their eyes westward. And out of that western country, they have always hoped, would some day come the deliverance that would rescue them from their murderous masters.

Mr. KING. Permit me to direct attention to a later period in the history of Turkey and the Christians within her borders. Russia declared her intention of becoming the protector of the Christian races in the Near East. The European nations were beginning to learn of the martyrdom of the Christian peoples who lived under Turkish rule. They learned of the barbarous treatment accorded the Armenians, the Greeks, the Bulgarians, the Rumanians, and the Serbians, but were unwilling to protect them if in so doing it required war upon Turkey. Russia's professed desire to mitigate the horrors of Turkish misrule brought but slight alleviation to the suffering Christians. In 1821 Greece revolted and won her independence. Later Serbia and Rumania achieved their independence, and finally Bulgaria threw off the Turkish yoke. Senators will remember that the Russo-Turkish War ended in 1877 and was followed by the treaty of San Stefano, under the terms of which Russia was to occupy a considerable portion of the Turkish territory until massacres and rapine ceased and governmental reforms were put into operation.

Unfortunately Great Britain, fearing the dominance of Russia in the Near East and the possible effect of such preeminence upon her Indian possessions, interfered, and the treaty of Berlin superseded the treaty of San Stefano. The Berlin treaty promised Turkish protection to the Armenians, and Great Britain agreed to help the Turkish Empire in the event of a controversy with Russia. But Turkey, in violation of her solemn pledges, continued her persecution of the Armenian people and of the Christian minorities within her domain. In 1880 the powers joined in a note to Turkey, demanding observance of her promises and an immediate cessation of Armenian and Christian persecution. This demand was wholly ignored by Turkey, and the massacres continued periodically and the promised reforms were denied to the non-Moslem populations of Turkey. In 1894-95 the Sultan, Abdul-Hamid, caused to be murdered more than 100,000 Armenians. In 1908, 700,000 Armenians were destroyed. The awful carnage was continuing when the Christian

nations of the world, horrified by wholesale massacres, protested, and secured promises of reform. The young Turks obtained control of the Government, and European nations, as well as the United States, hoped that the promises of a liberal government would be realized. The new régime solemnly agreed that there would be no further enslavement of the Armenians, no further confiscation of property, and a just system of taxation, the rights of the Armenians to be regarded as citizens and to bear arms and to have places in the army and a voice in the administrative affairs of the Empire. But none of these promises were fulfilled.

In 1914 the great World War began. It is difficult to ascertain the number of Armenians then living in Asiatic Turkey. It is estimated by some that there were 2,000,000. Other writers place the number at 2,500,000. Senators will recall that a portion of what had formerly been Armenia had been annexed by Russia and Persia had extended her dominion over still another portion. What is now known as Azerbaijan, which is under Soviet Russia's control, was at one time a part of the Kingdom of Armenia.

When the war broke out there were residing in what is known as Russian Armenia perhaps 2,000,000 Armenians. There were several hundred thousand scattered throughout Asia Minor, and approximately 150,000 resided in Constantinople. Cilicia, which borders the Mediterranean Sea and at one time was a part of the Kingdom of Armenia, and is still known as Lesser Armenia, contained many thousand Armenians, and tens of thousands resided in the Provinces of Broussa and Adin, which includes the Smyrna district. As I have heretofore stated, the portion of what was formerly the Armenian Kingdom constitutes a part of Russia.

At the outbreak of the World War the Armenian people were placed in a most unfortunate and, indeed, dangerous position. Turkey was under the influence of the Kaiser and the military elements surrounding him. After intriguing for some time Turkey joined the Central Empires. German diplomats were in Turkey directing her political movements and German officers were in her armies training and preparing them to support the Central Empires. When Russia mobilized her armies to repel the German and Austrian invasion of her territory the Armenians within Russia entered the Russian armies and rendered heroic service.

The sympathies of the Armenians, both in Turkey and in Russia, were with the Allies. They believed the contest was between democracy and liberty upon one hand and militarism and autocracy upon the other hand. They had struggled for centuries for liberty and realized that so long as the Turkish power existed they would be under the heel of the cruel Turks. However, when Turkey entered the war the Armenians residing within Turkish Armenia endeavored to discharge their obligations to their Government. Thousands of them were drafted into the army for menial service, and many were employed in the construction of roads and bridges and in transporting Turkish munitions and military supplies.

It is difficult to understand just what motives inspired the Turkish rulers to execute the cowardly and cruel purpose which

soon became manifest. Authentic reports indicate that German military leaders who were in Turkey, if they did not direct, at least approved the plan for the wholesale extermination of the Armenian race within Turkish territory, or at least within Turkish Armenia.

At the time Turkey entered the war there were perhaps, as I have stated, more than 2,000,000 of Armenians under the Turkish flag. The greater part of them were in the seven Armenian vilyats or provinces, viz, Erzerum, Van, Bitlis, Trebizon, Manvouret-ul-Aziz, Diarbekr, and Sivas.

The census prepared by the Armenian patriarchate in 1912 shows the Armenians within the provinces just named to have been considerably more than 1,100,000. In addition, there were Nestorians, Greeks, and other Christians, numbering more than 200,000. The number of Armenians in Russian Armenia at that time approximated 2,000,000.

I should have stated that when the young Turks obtained control of the Turkish Government and promised reforms and a mitigation of the persecutions and political and economic discriminations to which the Armenian people had been subjected, the Armenians welcomed these promises and entered wholeheartedly into the plan for administrative reforms and for the execution of policies which would strengthen Turkey, increase her prestige, and augment her prosperity. They showed a loyalty to the Government that was most extraordinary, in view of the centuries of wrongs which had been burned into their very souls. But the new régime soon became more reactionary than Abdul-Hamid and inaugurated a systematic scheme for the Ottomanization of Turkey, which meant the extermination of the Armenian population.

As illustrative of the purpose of the Armenians to aid Turkey in becoming a better and a greater nation, I call attention to the fact that in the Balkan wars the Armenians fought side by side with the Turks against the Bulgarians and other Balkan States. While they regretted war with Christian nations, they observed their obligations to the Turkish Government and fought for its protection. Their bravery and heroism challenged the admiration of their Turkish military leaders.

With the entrance of Turkey into the World War the Young Turk régime, which controlled, conceived the plan of exterminating the Armenians. They had abandoned all pretense of reform and had committed themselves to the policy of Prussianizing Turkey and inaugurating a Pan-Turanian movement. They dreamed of a great Turkish and Moslem Empire controlling the east, allied to a military power—Germany—which would control the west. They planned to conquer Egypt and Persia, and to bring under the political power of the Sultan at Constantinople the Mohammedan forces of the world.

The Armenians were Christians, and they clung tenaciously to the lands of their fathers and to the spiritual and moral inheritance which had come down to them from the past. They had resisted all efforts to bring them under the influence of the Moslem faith. Murder and rapine and persecution had not sufficed to extinguish their faith. Thousands of their children had been seized by the Turks and brought up in Turkish households. The tongues of fathers and mothers had been cut off by

the Turks, so that they might not teach their children the Christian faith. Many of their churches had been burned and thousands had been forced to worship secretly in forests and in mountain fastnesses and underground caves. Their cruel masters had subjected them to the most inhuman and fiendish tortures and persecutions, and still the race survived and within the hearts of the people burned that living and inspiring faith that raises humanity to glorious heights.

As I have stated, the Armenians who were subjects of Turkey when the latter joined the Central Empires in 1914 gave no cause for complaint of disloyalty. Many were drafted into the army, and thousands, as I have stated, were employed in the construction of roads and in various activities connected with military operations. No authenticated charge has ever been made of treason by the Armenians to Turkish authority during the war. Various excuses have been offered for the diabolical plan which was devised by the Turkish authorities, and systematically executed, for the extermination of the Armenian race. These pretexts have been carefully examined by Viscount Bryce in his painstaking and carefully prepared volume of nearly 700 pages, which was printed in 1916 under the title "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915-16."

Let me add at this point that this monumental work demonstrates beyond the possibility of a doubt that the Turkish Government deliberately planned the destruction of all Armenians within the boundaries of the Turkish Empire. The accounts of the frightful atrocities perpetrated by the Turks in the execution of this plan caused a feeling of horror throughout the world. Many in the United States and in Europe could not credit the apparently authentic accounts of the butcheries and premeditated deportations which were being carried out under direction of the Turkish Government. Viscount Bryce undertook to sift the evidence and to assemble documents and facts bearing upon this horrible crime committed by the Turkish Government. He gathered more than 140 documents, and a vast amount of indisputable evidence, which he presented to Lord Grey, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in Great Britain. Lord Grey, in thanking Viscount Bryce for the documents "on the Armenian massacres," described them as "a terrible mass of evidence."

In the preface to this exhaustive volume, Viscount Bryce states that—

The record of the rulers of Turkey for the last two or three centuries from the Sultan on his throne down to the district mutessarif, is, taken as a whole, an almost unbroken record of corruption, of injustice, of an oppression which often rises into hideous cruelty. * * * Can anyone still continue to hope that the evils of such a Government are curable? Or does the evidence contained in this volume furnish the most terrible and convincing proof that it can no longer be permitted to rule over subjects of a different faith?

Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, who subsequently was a member of the British cabinet, as I recall, of Lloyd-George, in reviewing the volume states that—

the evidence here collected with respect to the sufferings of the Armenian subjects of the Ottoman Empire during the present war will carry conviction wherever and whenever it is studied by honest inquirers. * * * It is clear that a catastrophe, conceived upon a scale quite unparalleled in modern history, has been contrived for the Ar-

menian inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire. It is found that the original responsibility rests with the Ottoman Government at Constantinople, whose policy was actively seconded by the members of the committee of union and progress in the Provinces. And in view of the fact that the representations of the Austrian ambassador with the Porte were effectual in procuring a partial measure of exemption for the Armenian Catholics, we are led to surmise that the unspeakable horrors which this volume records might have been mitigated if not wholly checked had active and energetic remonstrances been from the first moment addressed to the Ottoman Government by the two powers who had acquired a predominant influence in Constantinople. The evidence, on the contrary, tends to suggest that these two powers were in a general way favorable to the policy of deportation of the Armenians.

Permit me to add, Mr. President, that since the war further facts have come to light which prove that German diplomatic representatives and German military leaders who were with the Turkish armies not only connived at these massacres and deportations but encouraged them.

Hon. Moorfield Storey, in a letter to Lord Bryce, after reviewing the records submitted, declares that they establish—beyond any reasonable doubt the deliberate purpose of the Turkish authorities practically to exterminate the Armenians, and their responsibility for the hideous atrocities which have been perpetrated upon that unhappy people.

If time permitted, I should like to read from this volume accounts of the deliberate and merciless manner in which the Turkish Government proceeded in the execution of its wicked design. I shall only present one paragraph, from page 627:

There is no dispute as to what happened in 1915. The Armenian inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire were everywhere uprooted from their homes and deported to the most remote and unhealthy districts that the Government could select for them. Some were murdered at the outset, some perished on their way, and some died after reaching their destination. The death roll amounts to upward of 600,000; perhaps 600,000 more are still alive in their place of exile; and the remaining 600,000 or so have either been converted forcibly to Islam, gone into hiding in the mountains, or escaped beyond the Ottoman frontier. The Ottoman Government can not deny these facts, and they can not justify them. No precaution or misdemeanor on the part of individual Armenians could justify such a crime against the whole race.

The cumulative evidence shows that early in 1915 a decree was issued that all Armenians should be disarmed. Those who were fighting in the army were withdrawn and compelled to engage in road building, constructing fortifications, and in other work nonmilitary in character. Soon afterwards orders were issued and executed with methodical precision for the deportation of the male Armenians. No warning was given. They were immediately roped together or driven in groups from their homes in the cities and towns in which they lived into the deserts and mountains, where most of them were butchered. This fiendish plan was carried out in all of the vilayets to which I have referred, as well as in various parts of Anatolia. Some of the Armenians who belonged to the Catholic Church were exempted from the order, but in the main substantially all male inhabitants were deported and most of them murdered by the gendarmerie or by fanatical Moslems or by the wild and irregular bands of Kurds who infested the mountains and plains.

Later the women were ordered deported. Some, under promise of a renunciation of their faith, were permitted to remain. This meant that they were forced into harems or into marriage with some brutal Tartar. Many women and girls were ravished and butchered, and the long lines of deportees driven by

cruel gendarmes and Turkish soldiers fell by the wayside and perished in the mountain fastnesses and deserts.

Thousands died of hunger, thirst, and exhaustion. Brigands and outlaws assailed them, murdering some, carrying others into captivity. This horrible picture can not be properly delineated. No language can overdraw it, no words can exaggerate its hideous outlines.

Maj. Gen. James G. Harbord, of the United States Army, in 1919 visited many of the scenes of these massacres. He visited Cilicia and from there proceeded to various Provinces of Armenia, among them Sivas, Kars, Erzerum, Eriwan, and Tiflis. Members of the mission visited other parts of Asia Minor and obtained evidence as to conditions there prevailing and bearing upon the massacres and atrocities of the Turks.

Under date of October 16, 1919, General Harbord submitted his report to the Secretary of State. It is a strong indictment of Turkish misrule, and corroborates the statements of Lord Bryce and the reports which have come to the United States of the cruelties to which Armenians have been subjected. In his report General Harbord, speaking of the policy of extermination in 1915, refers to it as the "last and greatest of these tragedies." He states that—

massacres and deportations were organized in the spring of 1915 under definite system, soldiers going from town to town. The official reports of the Turkish Government show 1,100,000 as having been deported. Young men were first summoned to the Government building in each vilayet and then marched out and killed. The women, old men, and children were, after a few days, deported to what Talaat Pasha called "agricultural colonies," from the high, cool, breeze-swept plateau of Armenia to the malarial flats of the Euphrates and the burning sands of Syria and Arabia. The dead from this wholesale attempt on the race are variously estimated from 500,000 to more than a million, the usual figure being about 800,000.

He further states that the Armenians were—

Driven on foot under a fierce summer sun, robbed of their clothing and such petty articles as they carried, prodded by bayonet if they lagged; starvation, typhus, and dysentery left thousands dead by the trail side. The ration was a pound of bread every alternate day, which many did not receive, and later a small daily sprinkling of meal on the palm of the outstretched hand was the only food. Many perished from thirst or were killed as they attempted to slake thirst at the crossing of running streams. Numbers were murdered by savage Kurds, against whom the Turkish soldiery afforded no protection. Little girls of 9 or 10 were sold to Kurdish brigands for a few piasters, and women were promiscuously violated. At Sivas an instance was related of a teacher in the Sivas Teachers' College, a gentle, refined Armenian girl, speaking English, knowing music, attractive by the standards of any land, who was given in enforced marriage to the beg of a neighboring Kurdish village, a filthy, ragged ruffian, three times her age, with whom she still has to live and by whom she has borne a child. In the orphanage there maintained under American relief auspices there were 150 "brides," being girls, many of them of tender age, who had been living as wives in Moslem homes and had been rescued. Of the female refugees among some 75,000 repatriated from Syria and Mesopotamia, we were informed at Aleppo that 40 per cent are infected with venereal disease from the lives to which they have been forced. The women of this race were free from such diseases before the deportation. Mutilation, violation, torture, and death have left their haunting memories in a hundred beautiful Armenian valleys, and the traveler in that region is seldom free from the evidence of this most colossal crime of all the ages. Yet immunity from it all might have been purchased for any Armenian girl or comely woman by abjuring her religion and turning Moslem. Surely no faith has ever been put to harder test or has been cherished at greater cost.

Further on in his report General Harbord refers to the thousands of orphans who were receiving American aid. He

states that at the time of his visit 20,000 were being cared for at the expense of various relief agencies in the Transcaucasus, and that 50,000 were receiving Government or organized care along the route traveled by the mission accompanying him. He described the condition of the refugees who had survived and who were found in Transcaucasus as "pitiable in the last degree. They were in rags and 80 per cent suffering from malaria and other diseases." He refers to the statement made by Damad Ferid Pasha, who represented the Turkish Government at the peace conference in Paris in June, 1919, in which he admitted for the Turkish Government the commission of—

misdeeds which are such as to make the conscience of mankind shudder with horror forever—

and that—

Asia Minor is to-day nothing but a vast heap of ruins.

He mentions the plea that the Grand Vizier made in behalf of the Turkish Empire and his promise of reforms in the government of Turkey and for amends for the crimes committed. A few sentences of the reply of the council to this plea are as follows:

Yet in all these changes there has been no case found either in Europe or in Asia or in Africa in which the establishment of Turkish rule in any country has not been followed by a diminution of prosperity in that country. Neither is there any case to be found in which the withdrawal of Turkish rule has not been followed by material prosperity and a rise in culture. Never among the Christians in Europe nor among the Moslems in Syria, Arabia, or Africa has the Turk done other than destroy wherever he has conquered. Never has he shown that he is able to develop in peace what he has gained in war. Not in this direction do his talents lie.

I have referred to the Russian Armenians. Perhaps I omitted to state that Russian Armenia contains approximately 27,000 square miles within which in 1914 there were nearly one and one-half million Armenians. There were also several hundred thousand in what is known as southern Caucasus, so that in Russia there were approximately 2,000,000 Armenians at the beginning of the war in 1914. Perhaps one-tenth of the entire population was in the Russian Army fighting for the same cause and the same principles as the United States contended for when it entered the contest.

The testimony is uniform as to the bravery of the Russian-Armenian soldiers. Kerensky, speaking of their services, stated that soon after the Turks entered the war their military forces were marching victoriously toward Russian territory, and that while the Russians were preparing for flight the—

Armenians alone stuck to their posts, organized volunteer forces, and by the side of their Russian comrades faced the formidable assaults of the enemy and turned his victorious march into a disastrous rout.

After the collapse of the Russian army, following the overthrow of Kerensky, it was the Armenian soldiers who heroically met the enemy upon the Caucasian front. For six months they held back the Turkish armies and thus materially aided the British forces in Mesopotamia. They also captured Baku and finally joined the British forces at that point in July, 1918. General Ludendorf in his work declares that—

the principal factor that forced the breakdown of the German army in the west was due to the lack of fuel supply, because the Turks did not get to Baku in time.

It will be recalled that the military leaders of the Turkish forces withdrew thousands of them from the Palestine front and sent them to the Caucasus to join the Tartars in their military operations against the Russian Armenians.

After the Turkish order for the extermination of the Armenians had been executed, many who escaped joined the English and French military forces in Palestine and Syria and contributed materially to the victory which was won by General Allenby. Thousands of American Armenians, and Armenians who were not naturalized but who were living in America, volunteered prior to and after the United States entered the war, and fought with the American and French and British forces on many battle fields of Europe.

In 1916 M. Briand, who was president of the Council of Ministers in France, proposed to organize a legion, to be known as the Legion of the Orient. Syrians and Armenians in large numbers became members of this military organization; and it was declared that one of the principal objects of the organization was that its members might aid the allied cause and free Cilicia and Syria from Turkish control. Military leaders and statesmen of the allied nations all testify to the valorous conduct of the Armenian and Syrian soldiers and to their material contributions to the allied victory.

For centuries the appeals of the Christian minorities within the Turkish Empire for succor and support have occasionally aroused the civilized world, and, as I have indicated, upon a number of occasions demands were made of the Turkish Government that its massacres and persecutions of the non-Moslem populations should cease. During the war, and particularly after it became known that Turkey had deported and murdered more than a million Armenians, the allied and associated nations, including the United States, demanded that when the war was over the remnants of the Armenian race should be freed from the tyranny of Turkey and that there should be assigned to them a portion of their former kingdom, within which they might establish a government of their own choice.

Lloyd-George stated in the House of Commons that—
recognition of the separate claims of Armenia shall constitute one of the aims of Great Britain—

And in July, 1918, Mr. Balfour stated that the British Government was following with—sympathy and admiration the gallant resistance of the Armenians in the Caucasus in defense of their liberties and honor.

He declared, in substance, that the leading statesmen among the allied powers were in favor of a settlement of the Armenian case upon the principle of self-determination.

Clemenceau in July, 1918, said that one of the peace terms must be the—liberation of oppressed nations.

He referred to the—spirit of self-abnegation of the Armenians, their loyalty to the Allies, their contributions to the Foreign Legion, to the Caucasian front, and to the Oriental Legion, called later the Armenian Legion—

And stated that—these contributions have strengthened the ties that connect them with France.

He further declared that—

it was the purpose of his government, as well as that of Great Britain, to settle the fate of the Armenian nation according to the supreme laws of humanity and justice.

In the same year the Italian Chamber of Deputies, by a practically unanimous vote, resolved in favor of the independence of Armenia. When M. Poincare was President of France he addressed a letter in February, 1919, to the Armenian archbishop of Cilicia and declared, in substance, that by reason of the—

joint sufferings and tribulations of France and Armenia the two countries would now commune with each other with common joy and common pride.

He further stated that—

France understood that Armenia was to enjoy the benefits of security, of peace, and liberty.

Premier Briand in the Chamber of Deputies in 1921 declared that France would fulfill her international duties, not only to satisfy her allies but also her associates, the United States. He was referring to Armenia and the independence which had been promised to the Armenian race.

Mr. Asquith, when prime minister, in a speech on November 9, 1916, speaking of the Armenians, promised—

An era of liberation and redemption for that ancient people.

Lloyd George, in addressing the Trades Union Congress January 5, 1918, declared that—

* * * especially Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine are, in our judgment, entitled to a recognition of their separate national conditions. It would be impossible to restore to their former sovereignty the territories to which I have already referred.

Mr. Lloyd George, in the House of Commons on the 29th of April, 1920, referred to the Christian minorities in Cilicia and stated that the French were to exercise "guardianship over them." He referred to the struggle which was going on and expressed the hope that the Armenians would secure sufficient protection. Continuing, he said:

We can not disassociate ourselves from the responsibility that is cast upon us by our pledges in respect to the Armenians. If the United States of America feel that they can not take direct responsibility, we shall have to consider the whole position and will undoubtedly take our share in the matter of helping the Armenian community to equip themselves for their very difficult task, a perilous task.

I could refer Senators to numerous other statements made by representatives of the allied and associated nations with reference to the guaranties and promises made in behalf of the Armenians, but time forbids.

Permit me to call attention to the statement of President Wilson, appearing in his 14 points:

While the Turkish portions of the Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and absolutely unmolested opportunity for autonomous development.

During the war and following the armistice Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, declared in favor of a free and independent Armenian State, and announced that one of the objects of the war was to redeem the Armenians from the tyranny of the Turkish Empire. A great American, Theodore

Roosevelt, in an address delivered by him at the Lafayette Day exercises in New York City, September 6, 1918, said:

Germany has been able to wage this fight for world domination because she has subdued to her purpose her vassal allies—Austria, Turkey, and Bulgaria. Serbia and Rumania must have restored to them what Bulgaria has taken from them. The Austrian and Turkish Empires must both be broken up, all the subject peoples liberated, and the Turk driven from Europe.

He referred to Czechoslovakia and Poland and the Baltic Provinces, and declared that their rights must be considered. Speaking of the Baltic Provinces, he said:

They must be granted their freedom and independence.

Again, in this remarkable address, he said that—

Armenia must be free, Palestine made a Jewish State, and the Syrian Christians liberated.

Colonel Roosevelt correctly interpreted the spirit of the American people with respect to the objects of the war and the peace terms which should be written following the triumph of the allied cause.

I distinctly remember that the leader of the Republicans in the Senate [Mr. LODGE] stated in substance that the Armenians must be freed from Turkish rule.

The present Secretary of State, in a speech delivered February 8, 1919, referred to the friendship which the Americans had always entertained for the Armenians and the admiration which they felt for the intellectual alertness and sobriety of the Armenians. He further stated that:

We have revolted at the thought of such a people being under the yoke of the Turk. Now we rejoice that the hour of liberation has come. The vain ambition of brute force has overreached itself and has resulted in the emancipation of the downtrodden and oppressed of centuries. There is to be a settlement of this long account, and the credit balance is to be found in the opportunity for a free and independent life.

The Secretary then referred to the capacity of Armenians for freedom and self-government, and declared that:

We propose to-night to throw such influence as we have into the scale for Armenian independence.

After the withdrawal of Russia from the war the Armenian military units which had opposed the Turkish forces continued the contest until the armistice. In May, 1918, the Armenians residing within what is known as Russian Armenia declared their independence and set up a Republic with its capital at Eriwan. Recognition was accorded the new Government by the allied nations as well as by the United States. However, neither the allied nations nor the United States gave material aid or proper moral support to the Armenians in the perilous task before them. The Bolshevik leaders at Moscow sent emissaries to the new Republic to sow the seeds of dissension and followed them with military forces. The Turkish authorities at Angora sent Turkish troops to make war upon the Republic. These forces, cooperating with Bolsheviks and Tartars and Soviet soldiers from Ajerbaijan, made war upon the Armenian Republic. Left without support by the allied nations and after valiantly struggling for many weeks, their resistance was finally broken down and the brutal and motley forces of the Bolsheviks, Kurds, Turks, and Tartars overran the territory of the Armenian Republic.

Thousands of men, women, and children were butchered; hundreds of villages laid waste, and all the horrors, except on a smaller scale, which had been witnessed in 1915 under the exterminating policy of the Turkish Government, were again reproduced.

Perhaps I should add that after the destruction of the Russian-Armenian Republic the Communist authorities of Moscow permitted the establishment of a Soviet government in Russian Armenia; but it was a mere creature of the Bolshevik leaders and in no sense represents the aspirations and ideals of the Armenians. I record, however, the fact that after it began to function there was less persecution of the Armenians who were within its borders than they would have subjected to under Turkish rule.

In August, 1920, the treaty of Sevres was signed. While it recognized the independence of the Russian-Armenian Republic, it also provided that a portion of the Provinces of Erzerum, Van, Bitlis, and Trebizond, which were within the limits of the Turkish Empire, should be awarded to the Armenians in order that they might establish a government of their own. It was understood that Russian Armenia in time would be united with the portion of Turkish Armenia over which Turkish authority was extinguished, and that thus a strong Armenian Republic might be established. It was further provided that the President of the United States should delimit the southwestern boundary of the new republic, which he did in November, 1920, and under his decision approximately 42,000 square miles of the four Provinces before mentioned were awarded to the Armenians to constitute a part of their new State.

But even the treaty of Sevres failed to do justice to the Armenians. An important part of Turkish Armenia, to which they were entitled, and all of Cilicia, which is one of the richest Provinces within the Turkish Empire, were awarded to Turkey.

It is important to know that Turkey by the treaty of Sevres recognized Armenia as a free and independent State and agreed to accept the arbitration of the President of the United States upon the question of the boundary between Turkey and Armenia in the vilayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van, and Bitlis and upon Armenia's rights to access to the sea. At the time of the signing of the Sevres treaty Great Britain, France, and Italy entered into an agreement for the protection of the Armenians and other Christians in Cilicia, which was placed within the French zone. The Armenians had insisted that Cilicia should constitute a part of their Republic, but this claim was denied. However, it was understood that Cilicia would have an autonomous government under the protection of France. There had gathered into Cilicia many thousands of Armenians, Greeks, and other Christians, and they looked forward with faith and hope to the building up of a progressive and enlightened State in which liberty might be enjoyed.

Soon after the execution of the treaty of Sevres jealousies entered into the councils of the allied nations in respect to the Near East. France and Italy were not in accord as to their respective spheres of influence in the Near East, nor were they satis-

fied with the attitude assumed by Great Britain toward the treaty of Sevres and the obligations of the signatories thereunder. I shall not attempt an analysis of the causes leading to these jealousies and controversies. Perhaps they were inevitable, although I have felt that selfishness and greed influenced the conduct of each nation. However, I do feel free to say that Great Britain more earnestly sought to protect the Christian minorities in the Near East and to preserve the Armenian Republic. She has been criticized because of her desire to restore to Greece territory which formerly constituted a part of Greece and within whose boundaries the Hellenic peoples were predominant. Undoubtedly Great Britain was desirous of building up a strong Hellenic State, and she was likewise committed to the policy of establishing a strong and vigorous Armenian nation. Undoubtedly both Italy and France did not feel that this program was to their advantage in the Near East.

The Armenians had cooperated with France in driving back the Turkish armies and in conquering Cilicia. She had accepted by the treaty of Sevres a solemn obligation to protect the Christian minorities within Cilicia. But after she had signed the treaty she gave notice of her purpose to withdraw all military forces. Terror seized the Armenians and Greeks and the Christian minorities within Cilicia, because they knew that the gathering Turkish forces under Kemal Pasha would subject them to the same fate which had overtaken so many hundreds of thousands of their race.

When the Turks perceived the disunion and jealousies among the allied nations they became truculent and avowed their purpose to ignore the treaty of Sevres, and, if necessary, engage in further military operations. They established a revolutionary government at Angora and began the mobilization of the defeated Turkish armies.

I have referred to their invasion of the territory of the Armenian Republic, in cooperation with the Bolsheviks, the Tartars, and the Kurds, and the slaughter and the indescribable butcheries which followed their military successes. They now directed their attention against the Greeks who inhabited that part of Anatolia bordering upon the Black Sea and which was known anciently as Pontus.

Senators are familiar with the fact that hundreds of years before the Christian era a branch of the Hellenic race had settled along the southern littoral of the Black Sea. They organized a great and powerful State which represented Hellenic thought and Hellenic culture. The Greeks in those remote ages carried their laws and culture and civilization beyond the Greek States and free cities in what is known as Greece proper. Thrace, including Constantinople, was Greek; northern and western Anatolia was Hellenic; the islands of the Aegean Sea were peopled by the Hellenic race, and to the east on the mainland Greek cities and colonies were founded. There Homer was born, and many of the greatest philosophers and statesmen and leaders of the Hellenic race were cradled on the western shores of Asia Minor, in what are now known as the Provinces of Adin and Broussa and the district of Smyrna.

In 1920 there were about 1,500,000 Greeks in Asia Minor and nearly 800,000 in Thrace and the region of Constantinople.

There were approximately 1,000,000 Greeks in the vilayets of Adin and Broussa (including Smyrna), the number exceeding the Turkish population within the same territory. In 1914 there were nearly three-quarters of a million Greeks in Pontus and in other portions, not heretofore referred to, of Asia Minor. In 1919, in the vilayet of Constantinople, which comprises Stam-boul, Pira, and Scutari, and the suburbs as far as Chatalja, there was a total population of 1,174,000. Of this number only 449,000 were Turks.

In the city of Constantinople there were at that time fewer Turks than there were Christians. In Constantinople proper there were approximately 308,000 Turks and 250,000 Greeks, 140,000 Armenians, 38,000 Jews, and in the neighborhood of 135,00 belonging to other nationalities. There were fewer Turks in western Thrace than there were Greeks and Bulgarians.

I mention these facts for the purpose of calling attention to the justice of the treaty of Sevres, which awarded western Thrace to Greece, and reserved that part of eastern Thrace consisting of Constantinople and a few square miles east of the Chatalja line for further action by the allied and associated powers.

The government of Constantinople and environs was placed temporarily in the hands of a commission, but it was hoped that this district would be internationalized or placed in the hands of commissioners to be named by the League of Nations or by the allied and associated powers. At any rate, none of the victorious nations or their people conceived it possible that Constantinople would be returned to Turkey or that the Turkish Government would ever be permitted to exercise political authority in Europe. Gladstone had declared in his day that the Turks must be driven from Europe "bag and baggage." I repeat that when the treaty of Sevres was written it was felt throughout the Christian world that the Turk would no longer be permitted to rule in Europe. He had been a cruel, incompetent master. He had failed to do justice to his own race and had been cowardly and cruel in his treatment of other races under his flag.

Former President Taft expressed the views of the civilized world concerning the Turks when he said:

Speaking of the Ottoman Government, it is a lawless form of medieval autocracy, imposed on subject races by pressure from without; sustained by fraud and force; knowing no law; despising justice; alien to every instinct of humanity; deaf to sympathy; and glorying in the shame of the power to injure and destroy.

The Turks, realizing that they were in the minority in Thrace and in Constantinople, accepted the treaty of Sevres, and many of their leaders looked to the establishment of a Turkish capital at Angora or some appropriate place in Anatolia.

The allied nations were entirely willing that the Turk should have a home and a country. They were willing, notwithstanding the fact that there were hundreds of thousands of Christians within the boundaries of Anatolia, to incorporate them within the boundaries of the Turkish Empire and subject them to the rule of the Turkish people. They insisted, however, upon guarantees and reserved to themselves certain authority which would enable them to protect the Christian minorities from oppression at the hands of the Turks.

As I was preceeding to state, when it became manifest that the allied nations were drifting apart and that jealousies were separating them in the administration of Near East affairs, Kemal Pasha and other ambitious Turks began plotting and intriguing to destroy the treaty of Sevres, to further divide the allied nations, and to pluck victory from an admitted inglorious defeat. A rapprochement was made with the Bolsheviks, and material aid was given and promised by the Moscow government in the program which the Kemalist government was preparing to execute. May I add that the territory awarded to Turkey under the treaty of Sevres was rich and possessed many advantages as well as almost limitless resources. It was bounded upon the north by the Black Sea; upon the west were the Sea of Marmora and the Straits leading from the Aegean and Mediterranean Seas to the Black Sea. Its area was large—indeed so great as to afford for centuries to come homes for an expanding and growing population. But the defeated Turks planned for an ultimate victory, and responding to the sinister intrigues of the Bolsheviks soon developed grandiose schemes, and sought to embroil the Near East and Egypt and all Mohammedan lands in bitter and relentless war.

Their emissaries, joined by the secret agents of the Soviet Government, penetrated the new Arabian State and Egypt, Afghanistan, and far-off India, seeking to raise the standard of revolt and to precipitate a deadly religious war. France and Italy pursued a course that encouraged the military movements of the Turks. They sold them enormous quantities of military supplies, withdrew their armed forces from territory which they should have protected, and signified a willingness for the Angora government, under Kemal Pasha, to repudiate the Sevres treaty and to light again the fires of war.

In this situation the Turks continued their persecution of the Greeks and Armenians and other Christians who were within Anatolia. Hundreds of thousands of Greeks were deported and thousands of them butchered and subjected to privations and hardships which resulted in death. The history of the treatment of the Pontian Greeks is as tragic as many of the pages which record the cruelties and persecutions inflicted upon the Armenians. Tens of thousands of them were driven to Russia, and large numbers, after their homes were pillaged and towns destroyed, succeeded in escaping from their cruel persecutors and finally found their way into Greece or Constantinople or other cities and sections where there was temporary relief at least from the vengeful hand of the pursuing Turk. Thousands of Greeks and Armenians were murdered in Cilicia and in districts to the north and west, and most of the remainder were driven from Turkish soil.

The victory of the allied nations over the Central Empires and Turkey did not change the mentality of the Turks. They remained, and still remain, the same cruel tyrants, the same fanatical persecuting fiends that they have been in the past. There can be no protection for Christians under Turkish rule. So successful were the Kemalists in their schemes that the Greek military forces were driven from Asia Minor.

A great portion of Smyrna was burned, hundreds of thousands of Armenians and Greeks were driven from western Asia

Minor, from the Provinces of Broussa and Adin, and were forced to take refuge upon the islands of the Aegean Sea or in Greece, where they are destitute and suffering incredible hardships. Inflamed by these successes, the Kemalists forced the abdication of the Sultan and marched their victorious armies to the very gates of Constantinople. Great Britain sought in an honorable way to unite the Allies in some policy that would bring peace to the Near East and save the Allies from a humiliating and ignoble compact with the Turkish leaders. France, unfortunately, had entered into a separate treaty with the Kemalists shortly after the treaty of Sevres and Italy had signified negatively, if not affirmatively, her willingness for the Kemalist government to engage in military operations, destroy the Greek armies, and reconquer Constantinople. It is manifest that both France and Italy were jealous of Great Britain and were unwilling to see her dominant in the Near East or the controlling power in Constantinople and in the straits. The course of France and Italy, in my opinion, is regrettable, and has brought about the unfortunate conditions which I have described.

A united front upon the part of the Allies would have avoided all of these serious consequences. Great Britain indicated a willingness to defend important terms of the treaty of Sevres and to prevent the return of the unspeakable Turk to authority and control in Europe. France and Italy refused their support in the execution of this policy. As a result the Turk, arrogant and insolent, is again in Europe. The Turkish armies have marched through the streets of Constantinople and driven tens of thousands of Greeks from their homes in Thrace. These suffering people have been compelled to abandon their homes and their property and to seek an asylum in the congested lands, overpopulated and impoverished as the result of war and famine, to the south of them. The sufferings of these poor wanderers as they fled before their cruel dispossessors can not be described. Fleeing through the mountains, thousands of them perished and thousands who succeeded in reaching Greece found poverty and hunger and starvation awaiting them.

The allied nations have capitulated to the demands of the Turks. These demands prove that Turkey has won the war. The great western nations, whose representatives met the cunning Turk at the peace table at Lausanne, discovered that no matter what might be said of Germany or Austria or Bulgaria, it was apparent that Turkey was emerging from the World War as a victorious nation. Her representatives at Lausanne were truculent and were supported by Tchitcherin and the Bolsheviks of Moscow. They demanded terms which, in my opinion, self-respecting nations would not assent to.

The destruction of the Armenian Republic is confirmed and the remnants of the Armenians who were found in Asiatic Turkey are to be expelled. It is true there are but few remaining. The bones of hundreds of thousands of these martyrs lie bleaching upon the plains and in the mountain fastnesses of what was once the Armenian kingdom. The cruel Turk has at last triumphed. It has taken hundreds of years to accomplish his end, but now, with the connivance of Christian nations, he succeeds in driving from the land in which Armenians have

lived for more than 2,500 years the few survivors there found. In the centuries since these Asiatic barbarians invaded the homeland of the Armenians millions have been butchered and wrongs and cruelties perpetrated which 10,000 historians can not record. Is it possible that wrong is to triumph and justice to be denied? I am reminded of the biting words of Wilde:

Christ, dost Thou live, indeed, or are Thy bones
Still straightened in their rock-hewn sepulcher?
And was Thy rising only dreamed by her,
Whose love of Thee for all her sin atones?

For here the air is horrid with men's groans,
The priests who call upon Thy name are slain;
Dost Thou not hear the bitter wail of pain
From those whose children lie upon the stones?

Come down, O Son of God! incestuous gloom
Curtains the land, and through the starless night
Over Thy cross the crescent moon I see!
If Thou in very truth didst burst the tomb,
Come down, O Son of Man and show Thy might,
Lest Mahomet be crowned instead of Thee!

Mr. President, one will be justified in condemning those nations which have permitted Turkey to write victory above her banners. For weeks their representatives, led by Lord Curzon, have been pleading and fencing to secure a treaty from a nation that has practiced the murder of helpless people and waged a war of extermination against Christian races. Lloyd-George, speaking of them and their statements, said:

I remember representatives of Turkey admitting that millions of Armenian Christians have been slaughtered, ravaged, outraged, and tortured. Yet I know of governments that have not hesitated to make agreements with the people who take a leading part in the direction of those outrages and murders.

Mr. President, France and Italy should cower under these stinging words. They cut like a lash. They reveal the selfish, if not imperialistic, policies that have guided some of the allied nations following the treaty of Sevres in their dealings with the Near East and the stricken, sorrowing non-Moslem peoples.

Mr. President, I believe that the majority of the American people felt, even though the Versailles treaty was rejected and we did not enter the League of Nations, that there was an obligation resting upon the United States to aid the Armenians in obtaining their freedom and establishing an independent government. It is true our Government did not declare war upon Turkey and Bulgaria. In my opinion that was a mistake. They were our enemies as much as was Austria, and our military forces were operating against them as they were contending against the forces of Germany and Austria, though, perhaps, there were no points of actual contact. In 1917 I insisted that our Government recognize a state of war as existing between it and Bulgaria and Turkey, and offered a resolution which was a declaration of war against these nations. I contended that if we failed to declare war and no declaration of war came from them, when hostilities ceased we would be denied the opportunity of participating in the peace conference and have no voice in dictating peace terms.

However, as I have shown, the American people recognized, and our Government recognized, that one of the objects of the war was the defeat of Turkey and the establishment of an

Armenian Government. The duty rested upon the allied and associated powers to protect Armenia as it protected Belgium and Poland and Czechoslovakia. America failed, in my opinion, to do her duty toward the Armenians. We saw her abandoned by the allied nations and made no protest. Congress was apathetic and heard with apparent unconcern the piteous appeals from the Armenians for the redemption of the promises made by the victorious nations.

The American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, of which the Hon. James W. Gerard is and for several years past has been chairman and Hon. Henry W. Jessup has been secretary, and which has an executive committee composed of some of the most eminent statesmen of our country, including Secretary Hughes, Judge Parker, Elihu Root, Charles W. Eliot, Senators LODGE and WILLIAMS, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, and Hon. Edward P. Wheeler, has rendered invaluable and conspicuous service in behalf of the Armenians. This committee for several years has earnestly and faithfully labored to present the cause of Armenia and to compel our Government and the American people to discharge the obligations which they had solemnly undertaken for the protection of the Armenian people.

No praise is too great for the unselfish and noble work performed, particularly by former Ambassador Gerard and Mr. Jessup. No stronger papers have been presented in behalf of a worthy cause than those submitted by these men to the Chief Executive of the United States, the State Department, and to Congress and the American people. I wish time permitted the presentation to the Senate of some of the reports, addresses, and papers prepared by these two distinguished men. However, I shall ask permission to place in the RECORD without reading a statement found in one of the pamphlets submitted by Mr. Gerard under date of April 14, 1922, in which reference is made to America's responsibility in Armenia's tragedy. While I do not agree with all that is said, I recognize the splendid and logical presentation and gladly offer it for consideration.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY IN ARMENIA'S TRAGEDY.

Armenia joined the Allies in the war three years before we did and lost by actual fighting over 100,000 lives. Through the President of the United States we proclaimed to the world that the liberation of Armenia was one of the war aims of America, and later we reaffirmed the President's pledge by a congressional resolution. But we quit the war before we made any practical gesture to bring about the recognition of the rights of a little nation, which had fought on our side and which was no longer able to help itself. We did not forget, however, that the defeat of Turkey, to which we had contributed indirectly, had given us the right to claim, as we now officially do, certain economic advantages in Turkey. But this is not all.

When the peace conference was sitting the Armenians, relying upon the repeated and specific pledges of the allied powers that the creation of an Armenian State would be one of the fruits of victory, had no thought of turning to the United States for aid. They expected that the European powers would carry out both the letter and the spirit of their promises.

Indeed, during the winter of 1918-19 official spokesmen of France made deliberate and persistent intimations to the Armenians that they ask France to take a mandate for Armenia, of which nearly one-half

part had already been allotted to France by the secret Sazanoff-Paleologue convention of 1915 and the Sykes-Picot compact of 1916. But our delegation to the peace conference conveyed to the Armenians the clear impression that America was favorably disposed to the assumption of that task. Manifestly it was not for the Armenians to question the constitutional authority of an official body, headed by the President of the United States, ostensibly representing America. That such an impression, amounting to a promise, was given the Armenians was subsequently proved by the fact that the President asked the Senate on May 24, 1920, for authority to accept a mandate for Armenia.

While we rejected the proffered mandate by numerous subsequent utterances, some of them made by our highest officials and others embodied in our national party platforms, we continued to hold out to them the hope that we would help them to become a nation.

When the Armenians turned their faces to us and we, without regard to party, officially and unofficially held out to them the hope that we would help them we actually induced them to relieve the powers from their own responsibility to help them and thereby assumed a fixed and binding moral and legal responsibility to help them to become a nation.

I shall herein below set forth a set of facts which constitute, in my opinion, the bases of our responsibility toward Armenia, a responsibility which we can not shirk without stultifying ourselves. They show that for a continuous period of over three years we have held out to the Armenians the hope that we would help them—we have made solemn promises to help them—and thereby deprived them of the opportunity of looking elsewhere for help.

1. In December, 1918, Senator LODGE offered a resolution in the Senate in favor of the independence of Armenia, and further expressing the hope that "the peace conference—of which America was a member—will make arrangements for helping Armenia to establish an independent Republic." (The peace conference did make the hoped-for arrangement.)

2. On February 8, 1919, at a banquet held in New York, a representative American audience, after having heard Mr. Justice Hughes and Mr. Bryan, adopted Senator Lodge's resolution and cabled it to the President, who replied that "it struck a responsive chord in my heart."

3. On March 3, 1919, 20,000 ministers and priests, a cardinal, 85 bishops, 40 governors, and 250 college and university presidents subscribed to two petitions, addressed to the President, embodying Senator Lodge's resolution.

4. On March 17, 1919, Mr. Bryan cabled the President in favor of the inclusion of Cilicia in Armenia, and the President made a sympathetic reply. (Mr. Bryan suggested that we should keep the President's reply for future use and reference.)

5. During the winter of 1918-19, the American delegation to the peace conference conveyed to the Armenians the impression that America would accept a mandate for Armenia, relying upon which the Armenians refrained from responding to intimations made to them by France that they ask France to accept a mandate for Armenia.

6. On April 22, 1919, 75 bishops, by cablegram, expressed to the President the hope that America may accept a mandate for Armenia, to which the President replied that "You may be sure I share the deep interest in the fate of Armenia."

7. On May 25, 1919, 15 representative Americans, by cablegram, pledged to the President their sympathetic support in the matter of America's accepting a mandate for Armenia, in reply to which the President expressed "our deep appreciation of the trust reposed in us in a matter in which our hearts are very much enjoined."

8. On May 18, 1919, Colonel House assured us that the American delegation was giving necessary attention to the Armenian case and that it was in a satisfactory condition.

9. On May 21, 1919, the United States sent a warning to Turkey against her treatment of the Armenians.

10. On June 22, 1919, eight Americans, including Hughes, Root, LODGE, Eliot, Senator WILLIAMS, and others, by cablegram, urged the President that "either the Allies or America, or both, should at once send to Caucasus Armenia requisite food, munitions, and supplies for 50,000 men and such other help as they may require, to enable the Armenians to occupy the nonoccupied forts of Armenia, within the boundaries defined in the memorandum of the delegation of integral Armenia"; in reply to which message the President sent the Harbord mission to Armenia.

11. On September 8, 1919, Senator WILLIAMS offered a resolution in the Senate embodying the provisions of the Lodge resolution and, further, advocating the dispatch of troops to Armenia, etc. A subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, headed by Senator Harding, held hearings in September and October, examined numerous witnesses, some of whom had come from Armenia to appear before that committee, but did not make its report to the Foreign Relations Committee until May 14, 1920.

12. In the fall of 1919 the Department of State intimated that the President was favorable to making remedial recommendations to Congress for Armenia, if he could feel that the Republican leaders would support him; whereupon, on December 18, 1919, 10 Americans, including Hughes, Parker, Root, Butler, Hibben, and others, with the full approval of LODGE, asked the President to abandon the proposition of America's accepting a mandate for Armenia—since we were not a member of the league—and urged him that "the administration declare itself in favor of America's extending direct aid to Armenia, and to that end formulate a definite, continuing policy."

13. On April 23, 1920, we recognized the independence of Armenia.

14. On May 21, 1920, the President accepted the invitation extended to him by the allied supreme council to define the southwestern boundaries of Armenia, which he did on November 22, 1920.

15. On May 24, 1920, the President asked Congress for authority to accept a mandate for Armenia. Before the President had sent in his message to Congress we informed him, on the basis of careful inquiries we had made as to the attitude of the Senators, that it would be overwhelmingly rejected, and that its rejection would, in effect, constitute an invitation to the enemies of Armenia to attack her; and after he had sent in his message to Congress we warned the Senators in charge of the resolution in reply to the President's message, and also several other members of the Foreign Relations Committee, that a rejection of the President's request, without a substitute plan for helping Armenia, would be fatal for Armenia, but they did not agree with our conclusion; and thus the steps taken by the executive and legislative branches of our Government, for which the Armenians were in no wise responsible, resulted disastrously for Armenia.

16. In June, 1920, the Republican Party inserted a plank in its national platform which declared that "we deeply sympathize with the people of Armenia and stand ready to help them in all proper ways"; and the Democratic Party inserted a plank in its national platform which declared that "we express our deep and earnest sympathy for the unfortunate people of Armenia, and we believe that our Government, consistent with its Constitution and principles, should render every possible and proper aid to them in their efforts to establish and maintain a government of their own."

17. When Armenia was invaded by the Turks in the fall of 1920 the administration, in reply to our urging that it warn the Turks and the Allies, intimated that it was reluctant to do anything that might embarrass its successor. Whereupon on December 17, 1920, the American Committee for the Independence of Armenia, secured the approval of President-elect Harding to a note to be addressed to the powers, and copy thereof to be transmitted to the Turks, calling upon them to enforce and respect the Armenian provisions of the Sevres treaty, when the President would ask Congress for "such financial, material aid to the new Republic, when put in possession of its rightful territory, as will enable it undisturbed to attain in due time its proper development."

18. In May, 1921, the President expressed himself in favor of the independence of Armenia and of the American people and Government doing their share in the upbuilding of Armenia.

19. In May, 1921, Senator KING offered a resolution in the Senate in favor of the enforcement of the Armenian part of the Sevres treaty.

20. We have in our possession numerous letters written by the highest officials of the Government during 1919, 1920, 1921, and 1922, all of which, without exception, favor America's helping Armenia by this or that method.

The major conclusions to be drawn from the foregoing facts are that—

(a) The American people, speaking through their leaders and chosen representatives, made specific and solemn promises to the Armenians, during a continuous period of over three years, that America would help Armenia to become a nation;

(b) Armenia, relying upon the promises thus made by America, refrained from asking the powers to fulfill the pledges which they had made to her, and in one instance turned down a specific offer of help made to her by one of the great powers, and, by so doing, antagonized her;

(c) The United States Government waited for a year and a half to inform the powers and the Armenians of its decision with regard to

accepting a mandate for Armenia, and during that period held out to the world the hope that it would take a hand in the setting up of an Armenian State.

(d) The United States Government, after having waited for a year and a half to determine its course on the mandate proposition, in disregard of the warnings which have been given to it that a rejection of the proffered mandate without a substitute project to help Armenia would throw her upon the mercy of her enemies and of those whom she had antagonized by ignoring their offer of help, induced by our promises, made of the Armenia case a football of American party politics, with disastrous consequences to Armenia.

(e) In September-October, 1919, a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings in connection with a resolution favoring measure of direct aid to Armenia, thus holding out to the Armenians the hope of help, and thereby depriving them of the opportunity of seeking help from the powers—a step which would have constituted a gross act of disrespect to the Senate had they taken it—and without any good reason, and notwithstanding the obvious and admitted necessity for speedy decision by the subcommittee, affirmative or negative, waited for eight long months to make its report.

(f) The United States Government, by its failure to inform the powers within a reasonable time that it would not accept the Armenian mandate and by its failure to act within a reasonable time on a resolution—Senator WILLIAMS's resolution, referred to in paragraph (e)—delayed the settlement of the Armenian problem for a year and a half; and the President, who had accepted the invitation of the allied supreme council to define the southwestern boundaries of Armenia on May 21, 1920, by not rendering his decision until November 22, 1920, delayed the enforcement of the Armenian part of the Sevres treaty, which was concluded on August 10, 1920.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, it is well understood that President Wilson deeply sympathized with the aspirations of the Armenians. He was willing that the United States accept a mandate over Armenia. Let me emphasize a fact or two mentioned in the statement just placed in the RECORD. Our distinguished colleague, Senator WILLIAMS, offered a resolution early in 1920, which was referred to a subcommittee composed of President Harding, who was then Senator, and Senators WILLIAMS and NEW, extending congratulations to Armenia upon her independence and "recommending the dispatch of a battleship to the eastern waters and the landing of marines to aid in holding the Batum-Erivan line." A report was submitted, prepared, as I understand, by Senator Harding, which was ratified by the Senate, and it comprehended in its recommendation all that had been declared in the resolution. On the 24th of May, 1920, President Wilson, in a message to Congress, referred to Senator Harding's report and declares that it "embodies his own convictions and feelings with regard to Armenia and its people." He further stated that it was to the American people and their Government that the struggling people of Armenia turned—

as they emerged from a period of indescribable suffering and peril, and I hope that the Congress will think it wise to meet this hope and expectation with the utmost liberality.

The President asked for authority to accept a mandate for Armenia, but the Senate Foreign Relations Committee denied his request, and the Senate adopted a resolution refusing the Executive the power to accept a mandate as requested.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, in view of the statement as to what has happened to Armenia since the war closed, I suppose the Senator and I ought to feel that we did the right thing when we voted in favor of a United States mandate over Armenia as I remember the Senator and I did vote.

Mr. KING. The Senator is correct as to our attitude upon that matter, and I do not regret that I was one of the 12 Senators who voted to authorize the President to accept a mandate for Armenia.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Nor shall I ever regret my vote.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, after the allied nations refused to enforce the treaty of Sevres and the Kemalist forces were encouraged, as I have shown, to engage in further military operations, it became apparent to the allied nations that a state of war still existed between them and Turkey, and that some form of treaty must be agreed upon and formally ratified. In the spring of 1921 Lloyd-George, speaking for the allied premiers, submitted proposals as a basis for a revision of the Sevres treaty. One of the proposals called for recognition by Turkey of the rights—

of the Turkish Armenians to a national home on the eastern frontiers of Turkey in Asia, delimitation of the frontiers to be decided by a mission appointed by the council of the League of Nations.

This declaration was followed by a memorandum later issued by the foreign ministers of the allied powers which confirmed the proposal for such a national home. This proposition proved attractive to some who were sincere friends of Armenia, but it was evident that the plan was not feasible, and that it would not cure the long-standing evil nor bring relief to the Armenian people. It implied a division of Armenia between Turkey and Russia and the separation of the Armenian people. It recognized as a fait accompli the rightful and permanent assertion of authority by Russia over the Armenian Provinces now controlled by the Soviet Government. It likewise recognized the sovereignty of Turkey over the so-called Turkish-Armenian "home" within which it was proposed that the Armenians scattered in Asiatic Turkey and in Europe would gather. It was a denial of independence to the Armenians and the consignment to the grave of their centuries of hopes and aspirations for freedom and independence.

And, in the meantime, the insolent Turk has continued his plan to destroy the Armenians. He has realized the weakness and impotency of the allied nations to afford them protection or to impose upon Turkey terms of peace which justice and righteousness demand.

And the present administration, regarding the rejection of the Versailles treaty as a mandate to do nothing for Europe or for the Armenians or to discharge those obligations which our association with the allied nations imposed, looks coldly upon all propositions to aid the Armenians in obtaining their liberty and in setting up an independent government. It has refused to even express to the allied nations the deep interest of the American people in the fate of the Armenian race. It has refused to indicate to the signatories of the treaty of Sevres that in so far as that treaty protects the Armenians this great Republic, which has always championed the cause of the oppressed, is profoundly interested in its provisions, and views with deep concern any proposition looking to the modification of such terms and to the denial of freedom and liberty to the Armenian race, whose interests, it was understood, were involved in the World War.

Indeed, Mr. President, our Government apparently looks with unconcern upon the tragic conditions in the Near East. No voice of protest is raised against the deportation of Greeks from Thrace, the burning of Smyrna, the deportation of tens of thousands of Christians from the Smyrna district, and the deliberate execution of the cruel plan to accomplish the extermination of all non-Moslems now within Asiatic Turkey. It is quite likely, in view of this apathetic and calloused spirit, that we will soon be called upon to welcome the Turk into the family of nations, to resume intimate and most cordial diplomatic relations with him, and to accord to him the honors of a triumphant and victorious power. It seems as though but little is needed to complete the humiliation of the allied and associated powers.

Mr. President, the chapter will soon close. It will record the betrayal of a brave and heroic people, the denial of their aspirations, the crucifixion of their ideals, and it will show how great and mighty Christian nations, quarreling over the spoils of war and territorial concessions and spheres of influence, were willing to sacrifice a brave people who had fought with them for world liberty and the cause of civilization. It will likewise portray this Nation, the most powerful in the world—a nation which should exercise the authority of a moral and spiritual leader in the world—as having abdicated its high privilege and taken refuge behind the ramparts of materialism and self-interest.

47747—23718

